

Public provides input (PRC Section 5090.24(f). (Step 2)

Lisa Beutler told members of the audience that they would spend a little bit of time talking about priorities they would like to put forward to the Commission. They would talk about the four categories: conservation, law enforcement, restoration, and non-CESA projects. Within each of those categories, there are specific types of priorities that may occur. The Commission was interested in hearing the emphasis stakeholders would like to place in *relative* dollars do different categories. Commissioners were also interested in hearing what the public's priorities might be with regards to that.

Don Amador remarked that those categories are allocated by statute.

Ms. Beutler replied that funds are allocated by percentages, and it comes out of the \$18 million. Of the non-registered funds, 30% of funds would be allocated to restoration. That is formula-driven.

Mr. Amador: You're asking for public comment on that what cannot be changed.

Ms. Beutler: The 30% for restoration cannot be changed, but within restoration, there may be different priorities, such as closed area monitoring, informational signing, interpretative signing, or other priorities.

Ms. Beutler introduced the other members of her facilitation team: Jodie Monaghan and Julie Lee. Ms. Beutler divided participants into 3 separate groups, each with their own facilitator. Each group looked at each of the categories. Facilitators handed out sheets of paper with a list of priorities. Participants had an opportunity to give facilitators their idea of their top 3 priorities. The public spent 30 minutes working together before reconvening to report back to the entire group.

Broke into groups at 3:20.

The group reconvened at 3:58.

Ms. Beutler reported on behalf of her working group. For conservation projects there was a great deal of interest in educational signing and land ethics education. Because they both were education, the group felt they should be bundled together. The group is also very interested in trail stabilization and felt that was linked to trail reroutes. Trail reroutes might be an alternative approach if a trail could not be stabilized. They also wanted to put emphasis on the issues of monitoring for the purpose of wildlife studies and planning. The main idea was that monitoring was needed to prepare for or help you get to the next place you want be. It should be part of a whole package.

The group next reported on restoration projects. This was the #1 thing that they wanted to talk about. The group came up with an idea concerning restoration and closure. Closure should be for the purpose of protecting or creating a situation where restoration could occur. A restoration project could happen. Fencing could happen and fencing was essential.

Law enforcement field patrol was absolutely critical and essential. However all the field people noted that it wasn't possible to do field patrol without adequate training. Special training and field patrol are part and parcel and should be part of the package, with the emphasis being on putting people on the ground. Another idea was that if something was closed, either for protection or private property, that it would be important for law enforcement to ensure that that is occurring. Finally, there need to be signs so people know what is going on, supporting the law enforcement effort. It was also important to appropriate equipment to support the activity.

Finally, the non-CESA projects, the group emphasized equipment, equipment, equipment, and maintenance, maintenance, maintenance. Maintenance of restrooms, maintenance of trails, taking care of the plant, and having appropriate equipment to take care of the plant, be it a restroom or a trail.

Other comments included:

- Many people thought that everything was a priority on the list. Some people were afraid that an item didn't have dots, it wouldn't be funded. This is to recognize that individual grants should also be looked at for their merits as well as where they belong on criteria.
- There can be other categories. There are "hang-on" vs. "look-ahead" categories, such as maintenance vs. construction. There are crosswalks between categories and ways of looking at things differently in the same category.
- Many priorities, such as education and adaptive management, cross several categories.
- Signage should be in each category.

Dick Taylor said that the exercise was fun. Field patrol was very important, nothing like on-site enforcement. Much of law enforcement goes hand-in-hand. For example, safety and education programs. It's an occurrence of when a contact is made in the field. Whether it's a friendly contact or not-so-friendly contact, there is nothing that takes the place of a cop on the ground. Also field patrols address items such as closed area protection and things like that.

Priority Preferences by Category for All Public Participants (Aggregate of 3 Discussion Groups)

Conservation Projects	Law Enforcement Projects	Restoration Projects	Non-C.E.S.A. Projects
Wildlife Monitoring 5	Equipment Purchases 5.5	Land/Habitat Restoration 13	Equipment Purchased 6
Habitat Monitoring 1	OHV Training for Personnel 3	Closed Area Management 7	New Trail Planning 1
Wildlife Studies/Planning 3	Safety/Educational Programs 8	Trail Reroutes for Close Segments 15	New Facility Engineering 0
Habitat Studies/Planning 1	Field Patrol/Public Contact 26	Closed Area Monitoring 4	New Facility Development 4
Trail Reroutes 9	Violation Trend Analysis 0	Closed Area Protection 3	New Trail Construction 4
Educational Signing 11	Closed Area Protection 6	Informational Signing 6	Facility Operations 7
Land Ethic Education 13	Signs Relative To Law Enforcement 12	Interpretive Signing 11	Facility Maintenance 18
Land Acquisitions (Buffer) 5	Brochures Specific to Law Enforcement 3	Restoration Planning 10	Trail Maintenance 11
Trail Stabilization 17	Search and Rescue 4		Interpretive Signing 0
<i>New Addition: Outreach Offsite</i> 1			Maps and Brochures 4
			Land Acquisitions 4
			Safety/Education Programs 0
			<i>New Addition: Trail Reroutes</i> 1

Ms. Beutler pointed out that none of the groups appeared surprised each other by their respective reports. It looked like there were all very similar conversations, similar trends.

Chair Spitler thanked Ms. Beutler and the public for a very helpful exercise.